## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANDREW R. PERRONG	
1657 THE FAIRWAY #13	1
JENKINTOWN, PA 19046	į

Plaintiff

vs.

DENTAL SERVICES

Defendant.

Case No.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

## **COMPLAINT**

## **Preliminary Statement**

- 1. Plaintiff Andrew R. Perrong ("Plaintiff"), brings this action under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227, a federal statute enacted in response to widespread public outrage about the proliferation of intrusive, nuisance calling practices. *See Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs.*, *LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 745 (2012).
- 2. The as-yet unidentified Defendant in this action ("Defendant"), who goes by the generic name "Dental Services," and who transmits the caller ID 215-330-2542, sent pre-recorded message automated calls to Plaintiff, which is prohibited by the TCPA.
- 3. The Plaintiff never consented to receive such calls, which were placed to him for telemarketing purposes.

### **Parties**

4. Plaintiff Andrew R. Perrong is a Pennsylvania resident, and a resident of this District.

5. Defendant is unidentified at this time, and is only identified by its caller ID, 215-330-2542 and the generic name provided on the prerecorded call of "Dental Services." The Defendant engages in calling activity into this District, as it did with the Plaintiff. After this complaint is filed, Plaintiff will make a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1) to serve a subpoena on the carrier(s) for 215-330-2542 to ascertain the identity of the Defendant.

## Jurisdiction & Venue

- 6. The Court has federal question subject matter jurisdiction over these TCPA claims. *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Services, LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).
- 7. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, as the automated calls to the Plaintiff was placed into this District.

## The Telephone Consumer Protection Act

8. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA to regulate the explosive growth of the automated calling industry. In so doing, Congress recognized that "[u]nrestricted telemarketing . . . can be an intrusive invasion of privacy [.]" Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-243, § 2(5) (1991) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227).

## The TCPA Prohibits all Automated Calls To Protected Numbers

9. The TCPA makes it unlawful "to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice . . . to any telephone number assigned to a . . . paging service, cellular telephone service, specialized mobile radio service, or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged for the call." *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

- 10. Congress singled out these services for special protection either because Congress realized their special importance in terms of consumer privacy and therefore protected them (as in the case of cellular phones), or because the numbers are assigned to services, like Mr. Perrong's VoIP service, for which the called party is charged, thus shifting the cost of automated or prerecorded telephone calls onto consumers. *See Barr v. Am. Ass'n of Pol. Consultants, Inc*, 140 S. Ct. 2335, 2363, (2020) (Gorsuch, J. & Thomas, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).
- 11. According to findings by the Federal Communication Commission ("FCC"), the agency Congress vested with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, such calls are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient.
- 12. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).
- This cause of action applies to users of any one of the four protected services (pager, cellular, specialized mobile radio [i.e. radiotelephony locator beacons or dispatch systems], or another radio common carrier service [i.e. ship-to-shore or air-to-ground]), or any service, including residential, VoIP, and landline services, for which the called party is charged for the call. *See Lynn v. Monarch Recovery Mgmt., Inc.*, 953 F. Supp. 2d 612, 623 (D. Md. 2013).
- 14. "Non-emergency prerecorded voice or autodialed calls to [the destinations enumerated in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)] are permissible only with the prior express consent of the called party." This includes telemarketing calls. See FCC Enforcement Advisory: Tel.

Consumer Prot. Act Robocall & Text Rules - Biennial Reminder for Pol. Campaigns About Robocall & Text Abuse, 31 FCC Rcd. 1940, 1941 n.6 (2016) [hereinafter FCC Advisory].

## **Factual Allegations**

- 15. Defendant is a telemarketer and lead generator that places automated, prerecorded calls for the purpose of generating leads it sells to dentists.
  - 16. To generate the leads it sells, Defendant relies on automated calling.
  - 17. One of the strategies used by Defendant involves the use of pre-recorded calls.

## The Calls to Mr. Perrong

Plaintiff Perrong is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

- 18. Plaintiff's telephone number (the "Number"), 215-947-XXXX, is on the National Do Not Call Registry and has been continuously since 2005.
- 19. Despite this, the Defendant placed two telemarketing calls to Plaintiff on March 10, and 11, 2022.
- 20. The Number is assigned to a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) telephone service, which allows for voice calls to be placed over a broadband Internet connection.
- 21. That Number, which is assigned to a VoIP telephone service, is charged for each call it receives.
  - 22. The VoIP telephone service for the Number is Anveo.
- 23. The services charges a ring charge of \$0.005 for the provision of Caller ID Name lookup information for each call placed to the Number, even if the call is not answered.
- 24. The service also charges a per-minute charge of \$0.004 per minute for voice charges for each minute of talk time, including voicemail time, for each call placed to the Number.

- 25. The Number is therefore "assigned to a . . . service for which the called party is charged for the call" and any call placed to that number are subject to the restrictions enumerated in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- 26. On March 10, 2022 at 7:26 PM, the Plaintiff received a call from the Defendant with the caller ID 215-330-2542.
  - 27. The Plaintiff did not answer this call and the caller left no message.
- 28. Despite that, and the fact that he was on the National Do Not Call Registry, the Defendant made another telemarketing call to the Plaintiff.
- 29. On March 11, 2022 at 1:27 PM, the Plaintiff received another call from the same caller ID.
- 30. The call began with a recorded message indicating that the caller, "Dental Services," was calling to "assist [the plaintiff] with finding the local dentist that meets the [Plaintiff's] needs" and requested that the call recipient press "Press 1" if they wanted to speak with a specialist to schedule an appointment or, "Press 9" to be added to a Do Not Call list.
  - 31. Plaintiff pressed "1" to ascertain the identity of the caller and for no other reason.
  - 32. Plaintiff was then transferred to an automated system operated by Aspen Dental.
- 33. However, upon corresponding with counsel for Aspen Dental, Aspen claimed that they did not hire a lead generator to place the calls and did not authorize them and did not have an explanation for why Plaintiff was transferred to Aspen's automated scheduling system.
  - 34. At the conclusion of the call, the caller was not identified.
  - 35. In fact, the entire call was conducted with pre-recorded messages.

- 36. In addition, the calls were conducted using an Automatic Telephone Dialing System (ATDS) because it would be incongruous for a human to have dialed the call, only to play the caller pre-recorded automated messages.
- Moreover, calling back the number 215-330-2542 demonstrates that the calls were placed using an ATDS because, if called from 215-947-XXXX, the call connects to the same pre-recorded message, but if called from a different caller ID, results in dead air on the line, indicating that the automated system relies on a list to process inbound calls, and that list is limited to individuals who Defendant has called previously.
  - 38. The Plaintiff never provided his consent or requested these calls.
- 39. Based on this fact, it is evident that Defendant does not maintain Do Not Call policies and procedures as required by law, nor do they maintain an internal Do Not Call list.
  - 40. The Plaintiff was charged \$0.02 for the calls.
- 41. Plaintiff was harmed by these calls. He was temporarily deprived of legitimate use of his phone because his phone line was tied up during the automated calls and his privacy was improperly invaded. The Plaintiff was charged for the calls. Moreover, these calls injured Plaintiff because they were frustrating, obnoxious, annoying, were a nuisance and disturbed the solitude of Plaintiff.

## Legal Claims

## Count One: Violation of the TCPA's Prohibition Against Automated Calling Via Pre-Recorded Message

42. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations from all previous paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

- 43. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to the telephone number(s) of Plaintiff using an artificial or prerecorded voice.
- As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf's violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500 in damages for each and every call made to his telephone number for which he is charged for the call using an artificial or prerecorded voice in violation of the statute, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- Plaintiff is also entitled to and does seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf from violating the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to any number using an artificial or prerecorded voice in the future.
  - 46. The Defendant's violations were wilful and/or knowing.

## Count Two:

## Violation of the TCPA's Prohibition Against Automated Calling With an Automatic Telephone Dialing System (ATDS)

- 47. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations from all previous paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 48. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to the telephone number(s) of Plaintiff using an ATDS.

- 49. As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf's violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500 in damages for each and every call made to his telephone number for which he is charged for the call using an ATDS in violation of the statute, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- Plaintiff is also entitled to and does seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf from violating the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to any number using an artificial or prerecorded voice in the future.
  - 51. The Defendant's violations were wilful and/or knowing.

# Count Three: Violation of the TCPA's Implementing Regulations Codified at 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200

- 52. By placing at least two telemarketing calls to the Plaintiff, whose number is on the Do-Not-Call registry, failing to have a written Do-Not-Call policy, and failing to maintain the Plaintiff on its Do-Not-Call list, Defendant, jointly and severally, violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) by violating the implementing regulations codified in 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c) and (d).
- This amounts to six violations since Defendant committed three violations per call. The first violation is calling a number on the national Do-Not-Call registry. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2). The second violation is by calling Plaintiff without having a Do-Not-Call policy in place. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(1). The third violation is by calling Plaintiff without maintaining the Plaintiff on its internal Do-Not-Call list. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(6).
- 54. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute at least six violations of the

TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), codified at 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200, by, *inter alia*, refusing to scrub against the National Do-Not-Call registry, refusing to maintain Mr. Perrong's number on an internal Do-Not-Call list, and failing to have a Do-Not-Call policy.

- As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on its behalf's violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500 in damages for each and every call and violation made to his telephone number in violation of the TCPA's implementing regulations codified at 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B).
- 56. Plaintiff is also entitled to and does seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on its behalf from violating the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), by making calls in violation of any of the TCPA's implementing regulations in the future.
- 57. The Defendant's violations were knowing and/or willful. Accordingly, the Plaintiff seeks up to treble damages of the \$500 per violation award, as provided in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

## **Relief Sought**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests the following relief:

- A. Injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant from calling telephone numbers using an artificial or prerecorded voice and/or ATDS.
- B. Because of Defendant's violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in damages for each violation or—where such regulations were willfully or knowingly violated—up to \$1,500 per violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3) or 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

C. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Plaintiff requests a jury trial as to all claims of the complaint so triable.

Dated: March 28, 2022

Andrew R. Perrong

Plaintiff Pro-Se 1657 The Fairway #131

Jenkintown, PA 19046 Phone: 215-791-6957

Facsimile: 888-329-0305 andyperrong@gmail.com

## **Extremely Urgent**

This envelope is for use with the following services: UPS Next Day Au

UPS Next Day And
UPS Worldwide Express®
UPS 2nd Day Air®

nts

top.

Visit **ups.com**® or co to schedule a picku

#### **Domestic Shipments**

 To qualify for the Letter r correspondence, urgent of weigh 8 oz. or less. UPS those listed or weighing

### **International Shipments**

- The UPS Express Envelop value. Certain countries ups.com/importexport to
- To qualify for the Letter re UPS Express Envelopes w

**Note:** Express Envelopes containing sensitive person cash equivalent.



SHIP TO:
CLERK'S OFFICE
USDC EDPA
601 MARKET ST RM 2609
PHILADELPHIA PA 19 106

WAR 29 2022

MAR 29 2022

SHIP TO:
CLERK'S OFFICE
USDC EDPA
601 MARKET ST RM 2609
PHILADELPHIA PA 19 106

WAR 29 2022

MAR 29 2022

MAR 29 2022

Use this envelope with suppling documents printed from a laser or inkjet printer on plain paper.

Serving you for more than 100 years United Parcel Service.









International Shipping Notice — Carriage hereunder may be subject to the rules relating to liability and other terms and/or conditions established by the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage of Goods by Road (the "Warsaw Convention") and/or the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (the "CMR Convention"). These commodities, technology or software were exported from the U.S. in accordance with the Export Administration Regulations. Diversion contrary to U.S. law prohibited.

## Case 2:22-cv-01234-PD Document 1 Filed 03/29/22 Page 12 of 13

JS 44 (Rev. 04/21)

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS		
ANDREW R. PERRONG			Dental Services			
1657 THE FAIRWAY #131, JENKINTOWN, PA 19046 (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff MONTGOMERY			County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant \	JNKNOWN	
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES C	DNLY)	
			NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATION CASES, USE T OF LAND INVOLVED.	HE LOCATION OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Numbe	27)	Attorneys (If Known)			
	RRONG (PRO SE) OWN, PA 19046; 21		/AY			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)			(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) P Citizen of This State	ff <u>de</u> f	PTF DEF	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	nip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and of Business In a		
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			I CORRECTION PRODUCTIVE	Click here for: Nature of S BANKRUPTCY	Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	ORTS PERSONAL INJURY	FORFEITURE/PENALTY 625 Drug Related Seizure	422 Appeal 28 USC 158	375 False Claims Act	
120 Marine	310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury -	of Property 21 USC 881	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))	
130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	690 Other	INTELLECTUAL	400 State Reapportionment	
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgmen	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury		PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking	
151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability		830 Patent	450 Commerce	
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability	Y LABOR	840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit	
153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPERT	710 Fair Labor Standards	880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016	(15 USC 1681 or 1692)	
160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract	355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal	Act 720 Labor/Management	SOCIAL SECURITY	X 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act	
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal	Property Damage	Relations	861 HIA (1395ff)	490 Cable/Sat TV	
196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability	740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical	862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))		
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation	864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))	890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts	
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	791 Employee Retirement		893 Environmental Matters	
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voting 442 Employment	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate	Income Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	895 Freedom of Information Act	
240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/	Sentence		or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party	896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure	
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations  445 Amer. w/Disabilities	530 General 535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of	
	Employment  446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other  448 Education	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	462 Naturalization Application 465 Other Immigration Actions		Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X")	n One Box Only)	Commentent				
	moved from 3 te Court	Remanded from Appellate Court		erred from 6 Multidistr or District Litigation by Transfer		
	Cite the U.S. Civil St	atute under which you are	filing (Do not cite jurisdictional sta 47 USC 227; 47 CFR 64.1200	tutes unless diversity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of c					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 23, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAND \$ 15,000	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint: : XYes \( \sum \) No	
VIII. RELATED CASS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	DRNEY OF RECORD			
03/28/2022		M'	·. -</td <td></td> <td></td>			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	VOLVE	ADDI VING IED	HIDGE	MAG III	DGF	

## Case 2:22-cv-01234-PD Document 1 Filed 03/29/22 Page 13 of 13

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

tiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 1657	7 THE FAIRWAY #131, JENKIN	TOWN, PA 19046				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	BY TELEPHPONE CALL TO M	1Y PRIVATE TELEPHONE				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:						
Case Number:	Judge:	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answer	ed to any of the following questions:					
. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year Yes No V previously terminated action in this court?						
Does this case involve the same issue of fact pending or within one year previously termin	or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit lated action in this court?	Yes No 🗸				
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier  No   No   No   No   No   No   No   No						
1. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights  Yes  No   No   No   No   No   No   No   No						
this court except as noted above.  DATE: 03/28/2022  CIVIL: (Place a \( \) in one category only)	Allorney-al-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff	PRO SE  Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)				
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction	ı Cases:				
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and 2. FELA  3. Jones Act-Personal Injury  4. Antitrust  5. Patent  6. Labor-Management Relations  7. Civil Rights  8. Habeas Corpus  9. Securities Act(s) Cases  10. Social Security Review Cases  11. All other Federal Question Cases  (Please specify): TELEPHONE CONSI	2. Airplane Person 3. Assault, Defan 4. Marine Person 5. Motor Vehicle 6. Other Persona 7. Products Liabi 8. Products Liabi 9. All other Dive (Please specify)	mation nal Injury e Personal Injury al Injury (Please specify): ility altity — Asbestos ersity Cases				
I, ANDREW PERRONG						
ANDREW PERRONG  Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive	ffect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:  (a) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the two of interest and costs:					